

Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02195 01 OF 04 192007 Z

71

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ADP-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-09 H-02

INR-09 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-14

USIA-12 NEA-10 GAC-01 SAJ-01 IO-12 OIC-04 T-03 AEC-11

ACDA-19 OMB-01 INRE-00 RSR-01 /156 W
----- 093168

P R 191908 Z MAR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8118

INFO SECDEF/ WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 269

USNMR/ SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 4 VIENNA 2195

USNATO TAKE AS PRIORITY

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

EO: 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM

SUBJ: MBFR: AD HOC GROUP MEETING - 19 MARCH

SUMMARY SENT SEPTEL.

1. BILATERAL CONTACTS - TURKISH REP (TULUMEN) OPENED MEETING ON MARCH 19 WITH REQUEST FOR BILATERAL REPORTS. ONLY CANADIAN REP (CLARK) RESPONDED BY HANDING OUT EXCERPTS OF MBFR REFERENCES FROM POLISH VICE FOREIGN MINISTER' S SPEECH OF MARCH 12. SPEECH TOOK HARD LINE ON PARTICIPATION ISSUE AND CONCEPT OF " BALANCED" REDUC- TIONS.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02195 01 OF 04 192007 Z

2. CHAIRMAN' S REPORT - GROUP THEN RECEIVED PROPOSED CHAIRMAN' S REPORT FOR WEEK OF MARCH 12-17. SEVERAL DELEGATES NOTED THAT FIN-

AL PARAGRAPH CONCERNING SOVIET' S LINKAGE OF FRENCH PARTICIPATION TO CURRENT PARTICIPATION PROBLEM WAS TOO DETAILED AND MIGHT GIVE WRONG IMPRESSION. AFTER DISCUSSION IT WAS AGREED TO SHORTEN THE REFERENCE TO FRANCE AND ONLY MENTION THAT OTHER SIDE HAD RAISED QUESTION WHILE WEST HAD RESPONDED THAT THE ISSUE WAS A SOVEREIGN QUESTION THAT ONLY FRANCE COULD DETERMINE AND FRANC' S POSITION WAS QUITE WELL KNOWN.

3. UK REP (THOMSON), REPORTED THAT WHILE HE WAS RECENTLY AT NAC HE NOTED THE NAC MEMBERS ACCORDED MUCH HIGHER STATUS TO THE CHAIRMAN' S WEEKLY REPORT THAN THE AD HOC GROUP MEMBERS DID. US REP SUGGESTED IT WOULD BE BETTER TO CONTINUE THE RELATIVELY INFORMAL AND PERSONAL STATUS OF THE REPORT AND THAT BEST WAS TO CORRECT THE SITUATION WOULD BE TO ADOPT A STANDARD PHRASEOLOGY IN THE REPORT IDENTIFYING IT AS THE CHAIRMAN' S PERSONAL SUMMARY OF THE WEEK AS HAD BEEN THE UNDERSTANDING IN GROUP FROM THE OUTSET. CHAIRMAN ASKED MR. HILL, NATO REP, TO EXPLAIN AD HOC GROUP UNDERSTANDING OF CHAIRMAN' S REPORT TO COUNCIL AND SUGGESTED US REP WORK WITH PORTUGUESE REP ON STANDARD PHRASEOLOGY AND REVISION OF PARAGRAPH ON FRANCE. DURING PARAGRAPH BY PARAGRAPH REVIEW OF REPORT, UK REP INDICATED CONCERN THAT REPORT INACCURATELY SUGGESTED THAT ONLY THE OTHER SIDE HAD TURNED UP NEW THOUGHTS. HE SUGGESTED MINIMAL CHANGE OF ADDING THOUGHT THAT " BOTH SIDES" HAD RAISED NEW POSSIBILITIES. COMMENT: UK REP WAS AGAIN INDICATING THAT HE FELT EMISSARIES HAD COME CLOSE TO EDGE OF NATO GUIDANCE, ESPECIALLY NETHERLANDS REP IN SUGGESTING A SOLUTION WITHOUT MENTION OF HUNGARY. NO OTHER REPS TOOK UP THE ISSUE ALTHOUGH THE PHRASE " ON BOTH SIDES" WAS ADDED TO REPORT. CHAIRMAN AUTHORIZED TRANSMISSION WITHOUT FURTHER REVIEW OF REPORT AFTER REWRITE BASED ON GROUP COMMENTS.

4. PAPERS CONTAINING PARTICIPATION CONCEPTS - THE US REP DISTRIBUTED FOUR ISSUSTRATIVE WORKING PAPERS HE HAD COMPLETED AT REQUEST OF GROUP, EACH OF THEM OUTLINING A PARTICIPATING CONCEPT WHICH EITHER HAD BEEN OR COULD BE DISCUSSED WITH THE EAST. THE FIRST PAPER CONTAINED PARAGRAPHS A AND B OF THE ALLIED PAPER ON PARTICIPATION OF MARCH 13. THE SECOND PAPER WAS THE SAME AS THE FIRST EXCEPT THAT A NEW PARAGRAPH, HAD BEEN ADDED TO HELP VISUALIZE AND STUDY THE SOVIET CO- OPTION SUGGESTION. THAT ILLUSTRATIVE PARAGRAPH READ AS FOLLOWS: " IF, AT ANY TIME DURING FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS, ANOTHER STATE WISHES (OR: ANOTHER EUROPEAN STATE WISHES) CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02195 01 OF 04 192007 Z

TO BE INCLUDED AMONG THE STATES LISTED IN PARAGRAPH 1 (I. E., THE LISTING OF 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS), AND THIS IS AGREED BY CONSENSUS AMONG PARTICIPANTS IN PARA 1, IT MAY BE SO INCLUDED. SUCH INCLUSION IN NEGOTIATIONS OR DECISIONS RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE COULD EITHER BE GENERAL, OR, IF SO AGREED, COULD BE FOR THE LIMITED PURPOSE OF TAKING PART IN A PARTICULAR DECISION OR DECISIONS RELATED TO THE SUBJECT." THE THIRD PAPER WAS VISUALIZATION OF THE SOVIET (19 PLUS 11) SUGGESTION. THE FOURTH PAPER CONTAINED THE UK " MIRROR IMAGE" SUGGESTION FOR LISTING ALL 19 PARTICIPANTS IN THE

FIRST PARAGRAPH AND THE 7 SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS IN THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, LEAVING OUT A LISTING OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS.

5. THE TURKISH REP SAID THAT, IN HIS VIEW, THERE WAS A FIFTH PARTICIPATION FORMULA WHICH COULD HAVE BEEN DESCRIBED. THIS WOULD LIST 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND 8 CONSULTATIVE PARTICIPANTS. IT WOULD ALSO ALLOW FOR UNILATERAL STATEMENTS REGARDING THE DISAGREED STATUS OF HUNGARY. THE US REP REPLIED THAT THIS PROPOSAL HAD NOT BEEN DRAWN UP EVEN AS A THEORETICAL FORMULATION BECAUSE IT WOULD PUT HUNGARY IN A STATUS OF A CONSULTATIVE PARTICIPANT AND THUS COULD EXCEED BEYOND CURRENT NAC GUIDANCE. SUCH A PROPOSAL COULD, HOWEVER, BE WRITTEN UP AND USED AS A WORKING PAPER FOR INTERNAL ALLIED DISCUSSIONS. THE US REP ALSO SAID THAT PARAGRAPH 2 OF THE SECOND PAPER (SEE PARA 4 ABOVE) COULD BE MADE AS A UNILATERAL STATEMENT. THE TURKISH REP SAID THAT HE BELIEVED THAT ACCORDING TO HUNGARY A NEW STATUS WOULD BE A SOLUTION ACCEPTABLE TO THE SOVIETS. IT REPORTING TO THE NAC, THE ALLIES SHOULD BE PREPARED TO DESCRIBE EASTERN REACTION TO A PROPOSAL SUCH AS THIS. THE FRG REP SAID IT WAS HIS UNDERSTANDING THAT THE US WOULD PROVIDE A SYNOPSIS OF PROPOSALS ALREADY TABLED. IT WAS NOT THE GROUP'S INTENTION THAT THE US DEVELOP PROPOSALS WHICH HAD NOT YET BEEN TABLED. FURTHER, THE AD HOC GROUP DOES NOT HAVE A RIGHT TO DEVELOP AN ALLIANCE FALL-BACK POSITION. THE UK REP SAID HE SAW NO OBJECTION TO DRAWING UP OUR PAPER AS LONG AS IT WAS FOR THE INTERNAL USE OF THE GROUP. HE AGREED THAT IT WAS NOT WITHIN THE RIGHTS OF THE GROUP TO DEVELOP A FALL-BACK POSITION BUT SAID HE THOUGHT HIS CONCEPT IF PROPERLY FORMULATED WOULD NOT EXCEED PRESENT GUIDANCE ON KEEPING HUNGARY IN ABEYANCE.

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02195 02 OF 04 192055 Z

71

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ADP-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-09 H-02

INR-09 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-14

USIA-12 NEA-10 GAC-01 SAJ-01 IO-12 OIC-04 T-03 AEC-11

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 INRE-00 /156 W

----- 093483

P R 191908 Z MAR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8119

INFO SECDEF PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 270

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 4 VIENNA 2195

6. THE US REP SAID THAT AT THIS POINT THE MEMBERS OF THE AD HOC GROUP WERE NOT REQUIRED TO ASK FOR GUIDANCE ON THE PAPERS UNDER CONSIDERATION BECAUSE SUCH PAPERS SIMPLY ELABORATE CONCEPTS. THEY DO NOT PURPORT TO REPRESENT ANY KIND OF FINAL POSITIONS. IN POINT OF FACT, THE SECOND AND THIRD PAPERS SIMPLY CONTAINED VISUALIZATIONS OF SOVIET IDEAS. THE GROUP SHOULD NOT ASK FOR GUIDANCE UNTIL IT FEELS THAT A SPECIFIC PROPOSAL SHOULD BE PUT FORWARD OR UNTIL IT BELIEVED A PROPOSAL OF THE OTHER SIDE HAD BECOME SPECIFIC ENOUGH TO JUSTIFY A REQUEST FOR INSTRUCTIONS. THE CHAIRMAN AGREED.

7. THE UK REP SAID THAT HE DID NOT BELIEVE THESE PAPERS SHOULD BE SENT TO CAPITALS FOR REVIEW. INSTEAD THEY SHOULD BE USED AS TOOLS FOR DEVELOPING IDEAS WITHIN THE AD HOC GROUP. WITH REGARD TO THE TURKISH PROPOSAL OF A FIFTH PAPER (THAT IS, LISTING HUNGARY AS A SPECIAL PARTICIPANT), SUCH A PAPER SHOULD NOT BE PREPARED AT THIS TIME BECAUSE IT WOULD GO BEYOND WHAT THE GROUP HAD BEEN GIVEN AS INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE NAC. IF THE GROUP WERE TO GO BEYOND ITS MANDATE,

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02195 02 OF 04 192055 Z

THEN EACH MEMBER OF THE GROUP COULD FEEL FREE TO COME UP WITH HIS OWN PROPOSALS. IN THAT CASE, THE UK REP WOULD HAVE SEVERAL TO PUT FORWARD. IN ORDER TO AVOID THAT SITUATION, HE BELIEVED IT WOULD BE BEST IF THE GROUP WERE TO FOCUS ONLY ON THE PRESENT PAPERS AND NOT REPORT THOSE PAPERS TO NATIONAL CAPITALS.

8. THE TURKISH REP SAID THAT THE ALLIANCE HAD CONSIDERED A US FALL- BACK POSITION WHICH PROVIDES FOR PLACING HUNGARY IN THE STATUS OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANT. IT MIGHT STILL HAVE TO DEAL WITH A PROPOSAL FROM THE OTHER SIDE WHICH PLACED HUNGARY IN A SPECIAL STATUS WITH UNILATERAL STATEMENTS. SUCH AN OUTCOME WOULD BE SHORT OF THE US FALLBACK PROPOSAL AND THE GROUP SHOULD BE PREPARED TO COPE WITH IT. THE GREEK REP SAID THAT, IN HIS VIEW, IT WAS UP TO EACH MEMBER OF THE GROUP TO REPORT CONTINUOUSLY TO HIS CAPITAL ON THE ITEMS UNDER DISCUSSION WITHIN THE GROUP. THEREFORE IT WAS UP TO EACH MEMBER TO MAKE HIS OWN DECISION ON WHAT TO REPORT TO HIS CAPITAL AND WHAT NOT TO REPORT. HE ALSO SAID THAT , IN HIS VIEW, THE AD HOC GROUP SHOULD TRY TO REACH A COMMON POSITION ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE SENT TO THE NAC WITH REGARD TO THE PARTICIPATION ISSUE:
FAILING THAT, IT WOULD BE UP TO THE GROUP SIMPLY TO REPORT WHATEVER PROPOSALS HAD BEEN PUT FORWARD.

9. THE ITALIAN REP SAID HE HAD REPORTED TO ROME THAT THE IDEA OF A COOPTION CLAUSE SEEMED TO BE EMERGING INTO DISCUSSION WITH THE EAST. WHILE ROME HAD NOT GIVEN A FINAL REACTION TO

THIS IDEA, THE ITALIAN REP REPORTED THAT IT IS STUDYING THE MATTER. UNTIL THIS POINT, HE HAS BEEN TOLD THE IDEA SHOULD BE LOOKED INTO CAREFULLY. BUT IN ANY REVIEW OF CO- OPTATION FORMULAS, TWOMAJOR CONSIDERATIONS SHOULD BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT. THESE ARE: 1) THE WESTERN REPS SHOULD BE AWARE OF SOVIET EFFORTS TO BROADEN THE SCOPE OF THE TALKS (WHETHER IN TERMS OF PARTICIPANTS, GEOGRAPHY OR WEAPONS) BEYOND THE PRESENT LIMITS OF CENTRAL EUROPE. THE ITALIAN REP WARNED THAT FBS MAY SOON BE RAISED IN THE CONTEXT OF MBFR IN ACCORDANCE WITH SOVIET EFFORTS TO BROADEN THE SCOPE OF THE TALKS. THE SAID HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD LOOK ON ANY SUCH EFFORT WITH EXTREME CONCERN. 2) THE WESTERN ALLIES SHOULD KEEP IN MIND THE NEGATIVE POSITION WHICH FRANCE HAS TAKEN WITH REGARD TO ITS OWN INCLUSION IN THE TALKS. THE WESTERN REPS MUST AVOID ANY STATEMENTS ON FRANCE' S PARTICIPATION WHICH COULD LATER CAUSE EMBARRASEMENT TO FRANCE OR IMPLY THEY WERE TRYING TO CHANGE THE FRENCH CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02195 02 OF 04 192055 Z

POSITION. FINALLY, IT GOES WITHOUT SAYING, ITALY MUST REMAIN IN THE STATUS OF THE SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS.

10. THE US REP SAID HE WOULD SUBSCRIBE TO THE STATEMENTS MADE BY THE ITALIAN REP. THE TURKISH REP, REFERRING ALSO TO COOPTION PARAGRAPH OF THE SECOND PAPER, SAID THAT HE WOULD READ SUCH A PROPOSAL AS PROVIDING AN OPENING FOR THE INCLUSION OF OTHER PARTICIPANTS, SUCH AS YUGOSLAVIA AND AUSTRIA. BUT THE SOVIETS PROBABLY WOULD WANT TO USE SUCH LANGUAGE MAINLY IN AN EFFORT TO ALLOW THE LATER PARTICIPATION OF FRANCE. IT WAS THE TURKISH REP' S PERSONAL VIEW, HOWEVER, THAT THE SOVIETS SHOULD BE TOLD THEY WOULD HAVE A BETTER CHANCE OF ACHIEVING THEIR OBJECTIVE OF GAINING FRANCE' S INCLUSION IF THEY WERE NOT TO RAISE SPECIFIC FORMULATIONS ON THE MATTER. SUCH FORMULATIONS WOULD BE QUITE LIABLE TO ELICIT NEGATIVE REACTIONS. THE PROCEDURES PAPER AS IT WAS WRITTEN PERMITTED ADHERENCE OF OTHER STATES WITHOUT ADDITION OF A SPECIFIC PROVISION ON THIS. THE US REP AGREED, SAYING IF THE GROUP WERE TO AGREE THAT THIS POINT SHOULD BE MADE TO THE SOVIETS, THEN THE US REP WOULD BE WILLING TO RAISE IT DURING THE NEXT QUADRILATERAL MEETING WITHOUT SPECIFICALLY MENTIONING FRANCE OR ANY OTHER COUNTRY.

11. THE CHAIRMAN THEN TURNED THE DISCUSSIONS TO THE THIRD PAPER (THE SOVIET 19 PLUS 11 PROPOSAL). THE US REP NOTED THAT THIS PAPER CONTAINED ONLY THEORETICAL FORMULATIONS. THE OTHER SIDE HAD RAISED THE IDEAS. THE QUADRILATERAL MEETINGS HAD NEVER BROUGHT IN A DISCUSSION OF THEM.

12. THE UK REP ASKED IF IT WAS THE VIEW OF THE US REP THAT THE SOVIETS WOULD ACTUALLY ACCEPT A PAPER SUCH AS THE ONE UNDER DISCUSSION. HE QUESTINED WHETHER THE SOVIETS WOULD INSIST ON INTRODUCING LANGUAGE WICH STATED THAT ITALY WOULD BE CONSIDERED EQUIVALENT OF HUNGARY. THE US REP REPLIED THAT WHILE ALLIED REPS

HAD NOT GONE INTO DISCUSSION OF DETAILS THESE IDEAS, HE HAD THE IMPRESSION THAT THE SOVIETS MIGHT NOT INSIST ON SUCH A STATEMENT OF EQUIVALENCY.

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02195 03 OF 04 192038 Z

71

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-09 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-14 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 SAJ-01 IO-12 OIC-04 T-03 AEC-11 ACDA-19

OMB-01 INRE-00 RSR-01 /156 W
----- 093355

P R 191908 Z MAR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8120

INFO SECDEF/ WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 271

USNMR/ SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 3 OF 4 VIENNA 2195

13. THE UK REP SAID THAT IN HIS VIEW THE SOVIETS HAD PUT FORWARD TWO SPECIFIC PROPOSALS. THE FIRST POSITION WAS THE FOLLOWING:
11 STATES OUGHT TO BE LISTED AS POTENTIAL PARTICIPANTS IN FUTURE AGREEMENTS; SUCH A LISTING OUGHT TO BE ACCOMPANIED BY A STATEMENT AS TO WHY THESE PARTICULAR 11 STATES WOULD BE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS; THERE SHOULD BE A STATEMENT THAT OTHER COUNTRIES COULD BE INCLUDED AMONG THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS BY THE CONSENSUS OF THE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. FINALLY, THERE SHOULD BE A STATEMENT THAT AGREEMENTS REACHED SHOULD NOT PREJUDICE THE SECURITY INTERESTS OF ANY PARTY. THE SECOND POSITION WAS THE FOLLOWING: ALL 19 PARTICIPANTS SHOULD BE LISTED FIRST; THERE SHOULD BE A STATEMENT NOTING THAT THERE SHOULD BE 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND THERE SHOULD BE A DEFINITION OF WHAT WOULD CONSTITUTE A DIRECT PARTICIPANT; THE 11 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS SHOULD NOT BE LISTED; NONE OF THE REMAINING 8 PARTICIPANTS SHOULD BE PLACED IN ANY CATEGORY NOR SHOULD THEIR STATUS BE DEFINED. THE UK REP NOTED THAT HE DID NOT FIND A FULL REFLECTION OF THIS SECOND SOVIET POSITION AMONG THE PAPERS THAT HAD BEEN TABLED BY THE US REP. THE US REP TOOK NOTE OF THE UK COMMENT AND SAID THAT SUCH A PAPER WOULD BE PRODUCED.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02195 03 OF 04 192038 Z

14. THE CHAIRMAN THEN TURNED THE DISCUSSION TO THE FOURTH PAPER (THE UK "MIRROR IMAGE" PROPOSAL). THE UK REP SAID THAT HE DID NOT WANT THIS PAPER TO BE CONSIDERED AS A UK PROPOSAL. IT WAS HIS VIEW THAT HUNGARY SHOULD SPECIFICALLY BE MENTIONED IN THE FINAL PROCEDURES PAPER. FURTHER, THE WEST SHOULD EMPLOY SPECIFIC FORMULAE FOR MENTIONING HUNGARY, ALTHOUGH OF COURSE IT IS RECOGNIZED THAT AGREEMENT ON THESE EXACT FORMULAE MAY BE DIFFICULT. HOWEVER, SINCE THE OTHER SIDE HAD BROUGHT UP THE IDEA THAT HUNGARY NOT BE MENTIONED AT ALL, IT WAS THE UK REP'S OPINION THAT THE WEST OUGHT TO HAVE DEVISED A SINGLE RESPONSE WHICH WOULD TAKE ACCOUNT OF THAT EASTERN POSITION. HE ALSO WENT ON TO SAY THAT THE US PAPER FAIRLY REFLECTED THE UK "MIRROR IMAGE" PROPOSAL AS THE UK HAD PRESENTED IT IN PREVIOUS AD HOC MEETINGS.

15. THE UK REP SAID THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD NOT OVERLOOK THE FACT THAT DISAGREEMENT REGARDING THE STATUS OF HUNGARY COULD BE EXPRESSED CLEARLY IN A FINAL PROCEDURES PAPER. THE US REP RECALLED SEVERAL IDEAS PUT FORWARD BY THE DUTCH REP IN THIS CONNECTION. FOR EXAMPLE, HUNGARY MIGHT NOT BE MENTIONED IN THE PROCEDURES TEXT TABLED AT THE BEGINNING OF THE FIRST PLENARY MEETING. THE CHAIRMAN COULD MAKE A STATEMENT AT THE FIRST PLENARY TO THE EFFECT THAT THE STATUS OF HUNGARY WAS NOT FIXED. BOTH SIDES COULD THEN MAKE UNILATERAL STATEMENTS REGARDING THEIR VIEWS ON THE SUBJECT. BOTH THESE DISAGREEMENTS COULD THEN BE INCORPORATED INTO SUBSEQUENT EDITIONS OF THE PROCEDURES PAPER.

16. THE GREEK REP SAID THAT IN HIS OPINION THE FOURTH PAPER WAS "TOO GOOD TO BE OF MUCH USE". HE WOULD NOT EVEN REPORT IT TO HIS AUTHORITIES BECAUSE THERE WOULD BE NO DOUBT THAT THEY WOULD FIND IT ACCEPTABLE. BUT SINCE THE OTHER SIDE WOULD NOT FIND IT ACCEPTABLE, HE WOULD NOT WANT TO HAVE HIS AUTHORITIES PAY TOO MUCH ATTENTION TO IT. A MAJOR ATTRIBUTE OF THE FOURTH PAPER, HOWEVER, WAS THAT THE QUESTION OF THE STATUS OF THE BENELUX COUNTRIES COULD BE BROUGHT TO THE FORE ONCE MORE. BY TABLING THE FOURTH PAPER, THE ALLIES COULD ONCE AGAIN EFFECTIVELY USE THE THREAT THAT THE BENELUX COUNTRIES WOULD NOT BE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS IF HUNGARY WERE NOT TO BE INCLUDED AS A DIRECT PARTICIPANT. THE US REP SAID IT WAS HIS UNDERSTANDING THAT THE UK DEVELOPED THIS MIRROR IMAGE PROPOSAL MERELY TO BE USED AS A TALKING POINT AND NOT AS AN IDEAL OUTCOME FROM THE WESTERN SIDE. SINCE THE OTHER SIDE WAS ALWAYS MAKING OUTRAGEOUS STATEMENTS, THERE WOULD BE NO REASON WHY THE WEST

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 VIENNA 02195 03 OF 04 192038 Z

COULD NOT COUNTER SUCH STATEMENTS BY FLOATING AN IDEA SUCH AS THAT CONTAINED IN THE FOURTH PAPER. THE UK REP AGREED.

17. DISCUSSION OF THE 20 MARCH QUADRILATERAL MEETING. THE CHAIRMAN THEN TURNED THE MEETING TO THE DISCUSSION OF 20 MARCH QUADRI-

LATERAL MEETING. THE US REP SAID THAT HE WOULD INTEND TO MAKE V SEVERAL POINTS, SOME OF WHICH HAD ALREADY EMERGED DURING THE COURSE OF THE 19 MARCH AD HOC GROUP MEETING. FIRST OF ALL, HE WOULD MAKE THE POINT THAT THOUGH THE ARMED FORCES IN HUNGARY MIGHT BE DISIGNED TO BE IMPOYED AS PART OF THE WARSAW PACT SOUTHERN FLANK, THERE WAS NO PROOF THAT THIS WAS THE ONLY WAY IN WHICH THEY COULD BE USED. HE WOULD MAKE THIS POINT IN RESPONSE TO URGING BY WILLOT (BELGIUM). HOWEVER, HE HAD MADE THIS POINT BEFORE AND WOULD NOT INTEND TO DWELL ON IT AT LENGTH AGAIN. (WILLOT SAID THAT HE SIMPLY WANTED TO MAKE THIS POINT IN ORDER TO PREVENT THE WARSAW PACT FROM ESTABLISHING THE VOCABULARY TO BE USED IN THE EAST WEST MEETINGS. IT SEEMED TO HIM THAT THE EASTERN SIDE DESIGNATED HUNGARY AS THE PACT SOUTHERN FLANK AND AVOIDED ALL MENTION OF ROMANIA AND BULGARIA. THE GREEK AND TURKISH REPS HOWEVER ADVISED THAT THE QUADRILATERAL MEETINGS NOT DELVE INTO DISCUSSIONS OF HOW TO DEFINE THE WARSAW PACT SOUTHERN FLANKS. SUCH DISCUSSIONS WOULD RESULT EFFORTS TO DUB GREECE AND TURKEY AS EQUIVALENTS FOR ROMANIA AND BULGARIA. THIS COULD CAUSE PROBLEMS LATER IN NEGOTIATIONS.)

18. THE US REP ALSO SAID HE WOULD MADE SEVERAL OTHER POINTS. FIRST, THE EAST SIDE HAD CLAIMED THAT THE WESTERN POSITION THAT THE STATUS OF HUNGARY BE HELD IN ABEYANCE WAS NOT NEUTRAL. THEY HAD SAID THAT THERE WERE TWO POLES IN THE DISCUSSION AND THE WEST SIDE HAD NOT FOUND THE MIDDLE GROUND. THE US REP SAID THAT IN RESPONSE TO THIS ARGUMENT, HE WOULD NOTE THAT THE EASTERN SIDE HAD ONLY CLAIMED THAT HUNGARY SHOULD BE A SPECIAL PARTICIPANT. IN FACT, THIS REPRESENTED ONE OF THE POLES. THUS, THE EASTERN SIDE HAD NOT COME AS CLOSE TO THE MIDDLE GROUND AS THE WEST HAD.

CONFIDENTIAL

ADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 02195 04 OF 04 192108 Z

71

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 ADP-00 CIAE-00 DODE-00 PM-09 H-02

INR-09 L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-14

USIA-12 NEA-10 GAC-01 SAJ-01 IO-12 OIC-04 T-03 AEC-11

ACDA-19 OMB-01 INRE-00 RSR-01 /156 W

----- 093585

P R 191908 Z MAR 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8121

INFO SECDEF/ WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 272

USNMR/ SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 4 OF 4 VIENNA 2195

19. SECOND, THE US REP SAID HE WOULD REVIEW 8 FEBRUARY WESTERN PAPER WHICH HAD BEEN PRESENTED TO THE EAST IN ORDER TO DISCOVER THOSE POINTS ON WHICH THE EAST WAS NOT CLEAR. FOR EXAMPLE, THE ROMANIANS DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PARAGRAPH STATING THE RIGHT OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS TO SPEAK ON THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE TALKS. IF THIS POINT WERE TO BE RAISED TOGETHER WITH THE POINTS ON COOP- TION AND FULLER DEFINITION OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, THE US REP IN- TENDED TO MAKE CLEAR THAT THE EASTERN SIDE HAS MADE MANY MORE DEMANDS ON PROCEDURAL MATTERS THAN HAD THE WEST. IT WAS ALSO THE AIM OF THE US REP TO DISCOVER ANY HIDDEN PROBLEMS THAT MAY NOT HAVE BEEN BROUGHT TO LIGHT YET.

20. THIRD, THE US REP INTENDED TO TELL THE EAST THAT IF THEY DE- SIRED TO HAVE OTHER COUNTRIES INCLUDED IN THE TALKS, THEN THEY SHOULD NOT PUSH TOO HARD ON THIS MATTER. IN ANY CASE, HE INTENDED TO REITERATE THE FACT IF THE EAST RAISED THE ISSUE, THAT WESTERN REPS ARE NOT EMPOWERED TO SPEAK FOR FRANCE. THE NORWEGIAN REP QUESTIONED WHETHER THIS MATTER SHOULD BE RAISED WITH THE EASTERN REPS BECAUSE OF THIS SENSITIVITY OF THE SUBJECT. THE ITALIAN REP
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 VIENNA 02195 04 OF 04 192108 Z

ARGUED THAT THE WESTERN REPS WOULD NOT BE ADVISING THE EASTERN REPS BUT SIMPLY MAKING A POINT WHICH SHOULD BE MADE AT SOME TIME.

21. FOURTH, THE US REP SAID HE WOULD RAISE THE QUESTION OF WHETH- ER ALL PARTICIPANTS WOULD BE EXPECTED TO ADHERE TO ALL AGREEMENTS REACHED IN ORDER TO GET A CLEARER IDEA OF WHAT THE OTHER SIDE MEANT BY RECENT STATEMENTS ON THIS ISSUE. THE ITALIAN REP SAID THAT THIS " SELECTIVITY" WAS ACTUALLY PART OF THE WESTERN SIDE' S DEFINITION OF PARTICIPATION. THE US AGREED THAT THIS IS TRUE BUT SAID THAT THE WEST HAD NOT PRESENTED ITS POSITION ON THIS MATTER TO THE EAST. IF THE WEST COULD ELICIT ITS OWN POSITION FROM THE EAST IN ADVANCE, THEN IT MIGHT BEST TO DO SO.

22. FINALLY, THE US REP SAID THAT BESIDES MAKING THE ABOVE POINTS, NETHERLANDS REP AND HE WULD STICK TO THE NAC GUIDANCE ON THE STATUS OF HUNGARY. HE WOULD ALSO NOTE THAT THE WEST HAD MADE A COMPROMISE PROPOSAL TO THE EAST ON THE QUESTION OF HUNGARY' S STATUS AND WAS AWAITING EASTERN SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHERING THE DIA- LOGUE. THE UK REP AGREED AND SAID THAT THE WESTERN REPS SHOULD PRESS THE EASTERN FOR GENERALLY NEUTRAL PROPOSALS.

23. THE FRG REP (HOFFMAN) SAID THAT PERHAPS THE WESTERN REPS SHOULD NOT SEEK A MEETING BEYOND THE 20 MARCH MEETING UNTIL IT WAS CLEAR THE EASTERN SIDE HAD BEEN GIVEN INSTRUCTIONS WITH REGARD TO THE WESTERN ABEYANCE PROPOSALS. THE US REP SAID BE PREFERRED TO ASK FOR EASTERN SUGGESTIONS RATHER THAN FOR THEIR INSTRUCTIONS.

A FORMAL EASTERN REPLY COULD END THE DIALOGUE. ALSO, HE PREFERRED TO CONTINUE DISUCSSION RATHER THAN BREAK IT OFF AND OT DEPEND ON EAST TO TAKE INITIATIVE TO RESUME IT. THE CHAIRMAN AGREED WITH THE US REP.

24. THE CHAIRMAN THEN ADJOURNED THE MEETING. THE NEXT AD HOC GROUP MEETING WILL BE HELD ON 21 MARCH FOLLOWING NEXT NETHERLANDS/ U. S. SESSION WITH SOVIETS. HUMES

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 07 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 19 MAR 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973VIENNA02195
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730348/abqcellk.tel
Line Count: 497
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION MBF
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 10
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 27 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <27-Aug-2001 by cunninfx>; APPROVED <26-Oct-2001 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> wfs 971215
Subject: MBFR: AD HOC GROUP MEETING - 19 MARCH
TAGS: PARM, AU
To: STATE INFO SECDEF C
MBFR CAPITALS
USNMR SHAPE E
USLOSACLANT
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH
Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005